

To: Tristan Baurick[**Personal Email/Ex. 6**]
Cc: Roos, Judy[Roos.Judy@epa.gov]; Sisk, Richard[Sisk.Richard@epa.gov]
From: Forrest, Sabrina
Sent: Mon 5/6/2013 2:46:05 PM
Subject: RE: Upper Animas and Upper Cement

...

Hi Tristan, Upper Cement Creek is a smaller part of the overall Upper Animas Mining District, which comprises 3 drainages, one of which is Cement Creek. Unfortunately, the database information you can access does not adequately reflect or describe the sites' relationship. I have database housekeeping that needs to get done, but it is not a priority at this moment.

In the mid 1990s, there were efforts to list areas on a watershed wide basis, but that was never done in the Animas. There is a stakeholder group in the Animas that has never wanted to have Superfund list the entire watershed, or even smaller areas. In mid 2009, EPA, the BLM, and stakeholder group participants began focused water quality characterization work due to changes being observed in Cement Creek due to active water treatment that was stopped in the historic town site of Gladstone.

HRS scoring and possible listing were one tool that could have been used to address some of the most significant problems in the watershed. A draft HRS Documentation Record (i.e., listing package) was started in 2011 for Upper Cement Creek. Since that time the stakeholder group and community have again indicated they don't want to use Superfund to address the water quality issues and mine wastes that are impacting the Animas River. One of the more recent mining interests (Sunnyside Gold/Kinross) is also at the table and our long term remedial program and removal program have staff involved. If you would like to discuss that more, I would recommend that you contact them or the attorney assigned to the site.

Sincerely,

Sabrina

From: Tristan Baurick[**Personal Email/Ex. 6**]
Sent: Friday, May 03, 2013 2:37 PM
To: Forrest, Sabrina
Subject: Upper Animas and Upper Cement

Sabrina,

It looks to me like Upper Animas and Upper Cement Creek are two separate sites. They're listed separately on the database and they have a seemingly unrelated set of action dates.

Could you explain why they should be considered as one site?

Thanks,

Tristan